



**Maryland Longitudinal Data System Governing Board**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**December 14, 2018**

The meeting of the Maryland Longitudinal Data System (MLDS) Governing Board was held on December 14, 2018, in the Maryland State Department of Education Board Room, at the Nancy S. Grasmick Building. Dr. James Fielder, Chairman of the Governing Board, called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. and noted that a quorum was present.

**The following Governing Board members were in attendance:**

Dr. James Fielder, Secretary of Higher Education Commission  
Dr. Karen Salmon, State Superintendent of Schools  
Ms. Kelly Schulz, Secretary of the Department of Labor, Licensing, and Regulation  
Dr. Nancy Shapiro, Associate Vice-Chancellor for Education & Outreach (Designee for Dr. Robert Caret, Chancellor)  
Ms. Tina Bjarekull, President, Maryland Independent Colleges and Universities Association  
Mr. Christopher J. Biggs, Information Assurance Manager, Raytheon Company  
Cheryl Rollins, Director of Institutional Research (Designee for Dr. David Wilson, President)  
Dr. Scot Tingle, Assistant Principal, Snow Hill High School  
Dr. Jack Smith, Superintendent of Montgomery County Public Schools

**The following MLDS Center staff were in attendance:**

Mr. Ross Goldstein, Executive Director, MLDS Center  
Ms. Tejal Cherry, Director of System Management Branch, MLDS Center  
Dr. Angela Henneberger, Director of Research, MLDS Center and Research Assistant Professor, University of Maryland, School of Social Work  
Ms. Ann Kellogg, Director of Reporting Services, MLDS Center  
Ms. Dawn O’Croinin, Assistant Attorney General  
Ms. James Dixon-Bobbitt, Executive Associate, MLDS Center

**Approval of the September 21, 2018 Meeting Minutes**

Dr. Fielder asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the September 21, 2018 meeting. Dr. Salmon made a motion to approve the minutes, which was seconded by Mr. Biggs. The motion was unanimously approved.

**Summary of Center Output**

Dr. Henneberger began the presentation with an update on Research Branch output.

1. Research Series - the presentations were provided on the following topics as part of the ongoing series:
  - a. Poverty measures used by Baltimore City Schools;
  - b. Remedial coursework in Maryland community colleges; and
  - c. Effects of school concentrated poverty.
2. Research Reports - the following reports were completed:

- a. Remedial coursework in Maryland community colleges; and
  - b. The long-term effects of participation in a healthcare career and technical education program.
3. Other output and activity were completed over the past several months:
- a. Two presentations to the Kirwan Commission;
  - b. Three national conference presentations; and
  - c. Six grant submissions to federal and foundation funders.

In response to a question from Dr. Fielder, Dr. Henneberger said that national conference presentations generates feedback, questions, and requests for copies of the research. While Dr. Henneberger wasn't sure if there was a way to measure whether the feedback includes increased website traffic, Ms. Cherry noted that in general the Center's website had experienced an increase in traffic during the past year.

Next, Ms. Kellogg provided an update on the output produced by the Reporting Services Branch, including:

1. Dashboards
  - a. 21 dashboards were updated with new years of data;
  - b. Two dashboards were expanded with new data points; and
  - c. Two dashboard expansions are in currently in progress.
2. Reports
  - a. Annual Dual Enrollment was completed; and
  - b. Career Preparation Expansion Act Report was completed and submitted.
3. Other Output and Activity
  - a. Participation in a common education data standards workgroup that is developing methodologies for reporting wage outcomes;
  - b. Continued work and presentations on college degree to career pathways project; and
  - c. Website redesign.

There were 13 data requests from July to December, which is an increase compared to the same period last year. Of the data requests, eight have been completed, four are still in progress, and one request was for data not contained in the MLDS. The majority of the requests were from postsecondary institutions seeking information about student workforce outcomes.

Next, Ms. Kellogg reported on the collaborative engagements the Center has undertaken with different stakeholders. The Center worked closely with MHEC to conduct 10 stakeholder sessions to get feedback on a project to develop outcome reports for students who enroll in an Associate's degree or transfer program and whether those students graduate and move into the workforce or transfer to a four-year college, respectively. The feedback from the sessions was very beneficial and will be used to help shape the reports. Ms. Bjarekull asked whether it is possible to determine earnings by major? Ms. Kellogg responded that while it is possible, due to the lack of specificity with HEGIS codes, it is challenging and may not be completely accurate. Ms. Kellogg stated that MHEC is aware of the HEGIS issue and will begin work to address the concerns.

### **Data Inventory**

Mr. Goldstein noted that Laia Tiderman, has left the MLDS Center for a full-time position back at MSDE. Mr. Goldstein noted his thanks for Ms. Tiderman's hard work and many accomplishments for the Center.

Ms. Tiderman presented the proposed changes to the Data Inventory. MSDE recently made changes to its collections, which were necessitated by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Consolidated State Plan. Specifically, MSDE replaced the High School Status and Completers collection with the High School Data Collection (HSDC). In addition, MSDE added additional attendance information into the existing Attendance data collection. The complete list of data elements are provided in the memorandum to the Board. No data elements are proposed for removal.

In response to a question from Ms. Schulz, Ms. Tiderman clarified that the Attendance data additions related to homeless and immigrant status, have been collected by MSDE for a number of years, but were not provided to the Center. They are being provided to the Center now due to interest in these students' performance and outcomes. The data element related to direct certification for National School Lunch Program is new. ESSA requires states to identify economically disadvantaged students and the State Board of Education has defined economically disadvantaged as students who are directly certified for the National School Lunch Program. Ms. Schultz asked why these data elements had not been provided to the Center if they were available since 2008. Ms. Tiderman responded that it was an oversight on the part of MSDE and the Center. Dr. Henneberger responded to a question about the use of this data by noting that direct certification data will provide a critical second measure for student poverty, which will support several ongoing Center research projects. The other data will support analyses of programs supporting vulnerable students. Ms. Tiderman also clarified that the immigrant status does not provide information about legal status or language spoken. It only indicates that a student from another country has entered a U.S. public school for the first time. Finally, the Board continued to discuss the challenges presented by the various measures of economic disadvantaged.

Dr. Salmon made a motion to approve the changes to the data inventory, which was seconded by Dr. Shapiro. The motion was unanimously approved.

## **MLDS Annual Reports**

### Dual Enrollment Report

Ms. Kellogg provided highlights from the *2018 Dual Enrollment Report*, which was the sixth *Dual Enrollment Report* submitted and the fourth that utilizes MLDS data. Overall, there were 11,843 students who were dually enrolled in academic year 2016-2017. That represents a 15% increase from the prior year. There was also an overall increase in FARMS students and African American, Hispanic and Asian students. As with prior years, the majority of dually enrolled students are white, female, and not eligible for FARMS. In response to a question from Ms. Bjarekull, Ms. Kellogg clarified that the Center changes its criteria for what constitutes dual enrollment to any student who has overlapping enrollments in high school and college for at least one day. The original requirement was 30 days. The change was implemented to capture more students and ensure students were not being excluded. Ms. Bjarekull recommended looking at the duration of dual enrollment.

Ms. Kellogg went on to note that less than 4% of all high school students were dually enrolled in 2015-2016, and this year, about 4.5% were dually enrolled. The first year of reporting (2010-2011) there were less than 2% of all high school students dually enrolled. The number of African American, Hispanic/Latino, and Asian students dually enrolled quadrupled from 2010-2011 to 2016-2017. Collectively, dual enrollment from these three groups accounted for 40% of all dually enrolled students in 2016-2017 compared to 25% in 2010-2011. Dual enrollment rates for FARMS students increased six percentage points in 2016-2017 to 21% from 15% in 2010-2011. This increase translates to almost an additional 1,500 FARMS students participating in dual enrollment. Ms. Kellogg noted that this may

understated and is therefore working with the Research Branch to develop a more inclusive definition of FARMS that includes students with any history of eligibility for FARMS.

In response to a question from Dr. Shapiro, Ms. Tideman explained that charter school students are included in this analysis as their data are required to be reported to the local school systems. In response to a question from Ms. Schulz, Ms. Kellogg responded that the additional information and comparisons regarding demographic populations could be added to future reports. Finally, in response to a question from Mr. Biggs, Ms. Kellogg clarified that Table 13 of the report (page 22) provides an analysis of the number of additional students that are present on campus as a result of dual enrollment.

#### Career Preparation Expansion Act

Ms. Kellogg began by noting that this is the first year for the annual Career Preparation Expansion Act Report. The report was due on December 1<sup>st</sup> and was timely delivered to the General Assembly and Governor. The legislation establishing the report requires reporting on wages earned, hours worked, and industry of employment for high school graduates five years after graduation. While there is no data on hours worked, the report provides information on wage visibility to provide information on the level of engagement in the workforce. MLDS Center staff worked with the Governor's Workforce Development Board on the report.

Overall, the median quarterly wage for all of the graduates is \$5,916 at five years after high school graduation. In comparison, the median quarterly wage for just those who earned a bachelor's degree is \$9,539. This pattern of improved outcomes for bachelor's degree earners occurs consistently throughout the report. Ms. Kellogg also noted that generally, the bachelor's degree earners had less wage visibility, likely due to their focus on school instead of work. In contrast, those who do not earn a degree had much greater wage visibility.

Next, Ms. Kellogg explained that, to provide contextual information, the report compares the outcomes of the high school graduates to the MIT living wage indicator. Wages were determined using the *Stable Employment Methodology* developed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The methodology counts an individual as a wage earner if the individual: (1) has wages in the quarter of interest (in this case quarter 20 or five years post graduation); and (2) has wages in the quarter before and after the quarter of interest (in this case quarters 19 and 21). Using this methodology, 46% of the population was had stable employment and was included in the analysis. The report shows that the graduates who earned a degree had a median wage at or above the living wage amount. Those who did not go to college, went to college but did not complete (some college), and those still in college all had median wages below the living wage amount. Ms. Kellogg noted that the outcomes for the some college group were particularly concerning given that their attempt at college seems to produce negative workforce outcomes when compared to those who never attempted college.

Dr. Smith noted that while there are not a lot of certificate earners, their positive wage outcomes suggest the need for policymakers to do much more work in this area, including providing opportunities in high school to earn a certificate. Ms. Kellogg agreed with Dr. Smith's assertion and noted that the Center is planning to conduct more analysis on this topic. There was also a discussion to clarify that the certificates reported here are a postsecondary credential and not a license issued by the state or certification offered by private industry. Mr. Goldstein noted that there was recent legislation directing MHEC to obtain license information granted by state agencies and certain private issued certificates, which will be made available to the MLDS Center.

Next Ms. Kellogg discussed the analysis of the percent of individuals in each education attainment group that has median earnings above the living wage. Of the 46% of the high school graduates with stable employment only a third have wages at or above the living wage. In comparison, 63% of bachelor's degree earners have wages at or above the living wage.

The second requirement was to report on hours worked per week. However, since the MLDS Center does not have this data, the report studied wage visibility over the five year period to understand workforce participation. There were interesting patterns identified in exploring which graduates had wage data in each quarter. There was high visibility among all of the groups except bachelor's degree earners and other degree earners. The low visibility may be due to students going out-of-state for college or prioritizing school over work. Ms. Kellogg noted that the wage visibility pattern shows more workforce participation in summer and less in fall in winter when students would be more likely to reduce their working hours to accommodate school. Ms. Kellogg also pointed out that the pattern is present for the bachelor's recipients, but with less frequency.

The final requirement of the report was to provide the employment sector in which the high school graduates are working. For this analysis, a high school graduate had to meet the stable wage method requirements with the same employer. The employment sector varied by educational attainment. Once again the analysis shows that the degree earners fair better than those without a postsecondary degree.

Finally, Ms. Kellogg discussed next steps, which include creating dashboards from the report data; disaggregating based on race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and gender; reviewing findings by region or county; looking more closely at certificate earners, out-of-state college students, and the some college group; meeting with stakeholders to discuss the development of the next report; and applying the analysis to GED/NEDP completers. Dr. Fielder noted that it was a lot of information to digest and perhaps an additional discussion and chance for questions could occur at a future meeting.

#### 2018 Annual Report on the Maryland Longitudinal Data System and Center

Mr. Goldstein presented highlights of the Annual Report. The report has five required sections. The first section is about the implementation of the system and activities of the Center. Under system implementation, the report discusses the data metrics (number of records), identity resolution (matching rate), security activities including IDS, and issues regarding data center hosting. Under activities of the Center, the report discusses stakeholder engagements, data requests, Research Series presentations, and the Synthetic Data Project. The second section of the report requires a listing of all studies performed. The third section requires a list of data determined to be unnecessary, which is limited this year to the removal of the reference to the inclusion of IPEDS data in the data inventory. The fourth section of the report is a list of proposed or planned expansion of data, which includes the data inventory changes approved earlier in the meeting.

The final section of the report is recommendations from the Governing Board. After describing past recommendations made by the Governing Board, Mr. Goldstein asked the Board for their input to complete this section of the report. Dr. Shapiro proposed a recommendation for the Kirwan Commission to include the MLDS Center as part of its plans for accountability and evaluation of the implementation of the Commission's recommendations. Dr. Shapiro noted that the needed evaluations should not be outsourced to third parties, but instead should be completed by MLDS Center. Dr. Fielder agreed with Dr. Shapiro noting that that accountability is an important component and the Center has demonstrated its capability to provide meaningful evaluation. Dr. Smith also agreed noting that success needs to be linked to outcomes, and the Center is uniquely positioned to provide analysis on student outcomes.

In response to a question about Attachment B of the Annual Report, Ms. Kellogg explained that the pathway only pertained to students graduating with an Associate's of Arts in Teaching (AAT) who go directly into a teaching (as opposed to completing a bachelor's degree first). The number of such individuals is limited. Dr. Salmon noted that MSDE's preliminary analysis shows that the AAT program is very successful in producing teachers with good outcomes and is something that MSDE is promoting.

In response to a question from Ms. Bjarekull, Mr. Goldstein responded that staff is still able to keep up with data requests and its other workload requirements. While priorities get adjusted, so far, the Center has not had to inform someone that needed work cannot be done in the timeframe needed. Mr. Goldstein noted that this is due to staff becoming more experienced working with the database and the ability to reuse prior analyses.

### **Synthetic Data Project**

Dr. Michael Woolley, Professor of the Social Work at the University of Maryland provided an update on the Synthetic Data Project (SDP). Dr. Woolley, along with Dr. Laura Stapleton (UMCP), are the principal investigators on the project. The project has been ongoing for two and half years. The SDP is part of a seven million dollar State Longitudinal Data System Grant MSDE received from the Institute for Education Sciences (IES, U.S. Department of Education). The goal of the project is to create synthetic data from the real MLDS data. Synthetic data would allow more researchers to have access to data to run different analytic techniques. Synthetic data is a set of fictitious data that mirrors the statistical attributes of the actual data set. The synthetic data looks and acts like real data but there is no security risk because no real people are included. The project is broken up into four key tasks. The first task is to create gold standard data sets. The MLDS data in the ODS is large and complicated. To make it more manageable, the team has created two cohorts with limited selected variables: high school to college and college to workforce. The second task is to synthesize the gold standard data sets. This is a complex process that is accomplished one variable at a time. The third task is assessing the research utility of the synthesized data - can we research it and get the same results as the actual data. The fourth task is to determine the risk of disclosure - can someone take publically available data and the synthetic data and discover information about students. That concern is most prevalent with variables at the extremes of a distribution or small groups. Different strategies are used to ensure information is not disclosed, including adding "noise" into the system. Researchers are working to balance research utility and security. Finally, Dr. Woolley said that he will report back to the Board on the results of the risk analysis. Ultimately the Board decides whether synthetic data gets released.

In response to a question from Dr. Salmon, Dr. Woolley noted that the U.S. Census Bureau has created and uses synthetic data. However, their data is not as complicated as ours. Some parts of what the team is doing has not been done before. Maryland got the SLDS Grant grant because IES was deeply interested in this as a strategy for sharing data and getting more research utility from their considerable investment in longitudinal data systems nationwide.

Dr. Shapiro asked what is the value of the project to the State of Maryland. Dr. Woolley listed several benefits to the State and the Center. First, the gold standard datasets have a lot of research utility and will help lay the foundation for a data warehouse. Second, more research with Center data creates more opportunities to learn from that data. Third, this work will bring prestige to Maryland. Finally, if successful and utilized in other states, the availability of synthetic data will allow researchers to run the same analysis on multiple sets of state longitudinal data.

In response to a question from Dr. Fielder, Dr. Woolley responded that the synthetic data is not designed for commercial use - it is designed to facilitate responding to research requests. Further unlike other data sets, the synthetic datasets contain no personal information that would allow it to be used to sell things to a specific group of people. Mr. Goldstein also noted that the risk is the same with PIA requests - we don't know how people will use data. Ms. Schulz stated that it is an ethical issue because we are transferring risk from us to someone else and that we will not have any control over the process. Dr. Woolley agreed with that and noted that the researchers will be back to give the Board as much information to help the Board assess the risks.

Mr. Biggs asked whether a risk is created by people knowing how synthetic data was made (i.e. what "noise" was entered into the system). Dr. Woolley noted that consideration is included in their risk disclosure analysis in various ways.

In response to a question from Dr. Tingle, Dr. Woolley agreed that changing variables is an important consideration and suggested that it was partly addressed by the fact that each cohort is synthesized independently and thereby variable changes would be noted at the time of the new synthesization.

Dr. Smith noted that someone with their own comprehensive data set could use information from the synthetic data set to obtain commercially relevant information about Marylanders. Dr. Woolley agreed, noting that while the data sets can't be merged, the synthetic dataset could provide valuable insights in combination with another data set.

***2018 Annual Report on the Maryland Longitudinal Data System and Center (cont.)***

Based on Dr. Shapiro's suggestion, Mr. Goldstein presented the following draft recommendation for the Board's consideration:

The MLDS Governing Board recommends that the Commission on Innovation and Excellence in Education include, in its final recommendation to the General Assembly on the subject of Governance and Accountability, a role for the MLDS Center to serve as the primary resource for data driven research and analysis on how the implementation of the changes established by the Commission affect student performance and outcomes.

Ms. Bjarekull asked whether the Board should make a recommendation that the Center work with the Kirwan Commission on accountability. Mr. Goldstein responded that accountability and oversight is a final topic for the Commission. If there is an oversight board that hires evaluators, the Center should be a top consideration. The Center has the data, the expertise, and is accountable to the Board. Dr. Shapiro agreed noting that if the Board agrees that the MLDS Center should be the first resource, the Board should clearly say so. It is particularly important since there will be financial resources for the evaluation and those resources should go to a state entity - as opposed to a third party that would have to gather data from various agencies and put it together.

Dr. Salmon made a motion to approve the proposed recommendation. Dr. Smith seconded the recommendation noting that there were several reasons why this recommendation makes sense, including security, intense public interest, urgency of the topic and the fact that the Center has no profit motive. The motion was unanimously approved.

Next, Ms. Schulz made a motion to approve the *2018 Annual Report on the Maryland Longitudinal Data System and Center*, which was seconded by Ms. Bjarekull. The motion was unanimously approved.

### **Mid-Year Budget Review**

Mr. Goldstein began by explaining that there is one expenditure that was not contemplated when the budget was submitted last year. The purpose of this agenda item is to request Board approval to spend money. The request is related to the fact that MSDE is discontinuing its Race to the Top program and no longer needs the Oracle license used by that program. This leaves MLDS, which shares that Oracle license with MSDE, responsible for the full cost of the license. The Center is therefore at a decision point on how to proceed with the location and management of its data system. There are three potential options. The first option is to work with DoIT to build an Oracle environment in State enterprise data center. The second option is to move the system to Oracle's cloud. The third option is to migrate the system to SQL Server and reside within DoIT's enterprise data system. Each option has variety of costs, complexities, and staffing considerations. Accordingly, Mr. Goldstein stated that he and Ms. Cherry want to take a step back and hire an independent consultant to analyze the Center's technical, functional, and security needs and make a recommendation on which of the three options is most effective when considering the following: security; system management and oversight; cost; and technical specifications. Mr. Goldstein stated that the cost of such an analysis would be around \$20,000 and that it would be appropriate to use federal funds given the impact on the SDP project.

In response to a question from Dr. Shapiro, Ms. Cherry explained that the cost of the current Oracle license is \$800,000 per year, which will be the Center's sole responsibility next fiscal year. Ms. Cherry did not have a cost estimate for MS SQL, but noted that it would be considerably cheaper, and come with additional risks. Dr. Shapiro noted that her experience with other major IT infrastructure system changes demonstrated the need for careful analysis before making a change.

Dr. Salmon made a motion to approve the expenditure, noting that it is well worth the money to carefully analyze options before going down a particular path. The motion was seconded by Mr. Biggs and unanimously approved by the Board.

### **External Research and Grant Funded Projects**

Dr. Angela Henneberger began by thanking the Board for being supportive of the research grants so far and noted that these grants will help expand the research capacity of the Research Branch. Dr. Henneberger next noted that the Board approved her application for a grant at the September 2018 meeting on the topic of poverty and long-term college and career outcomes. After further consideration, Dr. Henneberger determined that the topic was too ambitious for the size of the grant being offered. She therefore divided the research plan into two projects, one submitted to the Spencer Foundation and the other to the American Educational Research Association.

Next Dr. Henneberger briefed the Board on two interim approvals.

1. Dr. Blazar's application to the Spencer Foundation on the to topic of *Modeling the Supply of Minority Teachers*. This research proposal seeks to extend research on minority teacher-student matches and build an empirical model of minority teacher supply, with the goal of informing policies to increase teacher diversity and provide new opportunities for racial, ethnic, and language minority students to work with a teacher like them. Dr. Henneberger noted that the grant is cross sector, addresses several questions under the Research Agenda and provides a benefit to the state by informing the development of future teacher development policies and practices.

2. Dr. Blazar's application to the Russell Sage Foundation on the topic of school-based diversity. Over the last several decades, there has been a large shift in demographics of the U.S., particularly in urban communities, raising questions about the effects of increased diversity on both short-term schooling outcomes -- where debates regarding inclusion and integration largely have played out -- and long-term economic opportunity. This project will examine how school-based diversity -- defined by the racial, ethnic, and language composition within schools -- predicts college enrollment and persistence, and wages. The project is cross-sector, addresses questions under the Research Agenda and will help policy makers disentangle the role of student, school and neighborhood demographic characteristics to help policy makers determine the best ways in which to intervene for diverse students.

Finally, Dr. Henneberger turned to a new grant for which Board approval is being sought. The grant is to the National Science Foundation and focuses on Maryland STEM production. The grant is for \$1.5 million over three years. Dr. Jane Lincove is the principle investigator along with Dr. Henneberger and Dr. Blazar. The grant application is due on January 24<sup>th</sup>, and if received, would start this summer. Maryland is a strong performer in STEM secondary, postsecondary, and workforce production, however, there are more jobs than what Maryland produces. Furthermore, there is an under-representation of minority and low income students in STEM fields. Examining the high school determinants of STEM college and career outcomes is critical for determining the best policies to implement to increase Maryland's STEM production. This project addresses several questions under the Research Agenda and is cross sector. In response to a question from Dr. Fielder, Dr. Henneberger responded that data is available to analyze the impact of STEM education starting in middle school.

Mr. Goldstein noted that the Center's internal review and the review by the Research and Policy Advisory Board were favorable. The project addresses Research Agenda questions and provides important benefits for the state. Finally, Dr. Lincove has worked with the Center and has the capability to carry out the project.

Ms. Schulz noted that Governor Hogan has identified STEM education as a top priority and therefore moves the approval of the application. The motion was seconded by Dr. Salmon and was unanimously approved by the Board.

### **New Business**

Mr. Marty McGowan, legislative aide to Delegate Alonzo Washington stated that Delegate Washington is considering legislation for the 2019 Session to remove the provision in state law that prohibits the MLDS from including student discipline records and juvenile justice records in the MLDS.

The reason for this proposed change is to establish a relationship between the over-reliance on exclusionary discipline and the students who are pushed out of the educational system and into the juvenile justice and criminal justice systems -- also known as the school-to-prison pipeline. For the past several years, researchers and scholars in Maryland have expressed their frustrations to Del. Washington about their inability to accurately measure the school-to-prison pipeline in our State due to inaccessible data. By allowing MLDS to capture and analyze data on student discipline and juvenile justice, researchers and policymakers will be able to measure the school-to-prison pipeline as well as disproportionality in school discipline practices and overall student outcomes as they relate to exclusionary discipline. School administrators will also have the ability to understand if certain schools or teachers are using exclusionary discipline practices at higher rates, which could provide opportunities for better teacher training.

The second reason for this proposal is that not including this data in their research creates unintentional biases in current data reporting and research. When estimating the associations between early educational experiences and later life outcomes, the inability to control for exclusionary discipline and juvenile justice experiences leads researchers to overestimate relations between early factors and outcomes. This is because disciplinary practices are related to later life outcomes, so not controlling for discipline mis-attributes some of that relation to the relation of interest in the MLDS. Controlling for disciplinary practices would help to more accurately estimate the long-term academic and career outcomes of Maryland students.

Finally, Mr. McGowan noted that Delegate Washington wants to work with the Center to ensure ongoing data security and privacy. In response to a question from Mr. Biggs, Ms. O’Croinin responded that if the statutory restriction against collecting juvenile services information was removed, data would be collected from the Department of Juvenile Services in the same manner that it is collected with other partner agencies. Ms. Schulz noted her appreciation for Delegate Washington’s interest in this issue and noted that other parties have also been interested in adding this type of data. Ms. Schulz went on to point out that the General Assembly specifically restricted certain types of data from the MLDS. Therefore Ms. Schulz is not comfortable supporting this proposal without first hearing from the General Assembly. In response to a question from Ms. Bjarekull, Mr. McGowan confirmed that the legislation would only focus on elementary and secondary discipline data.

**Closing**

Dr. Fielder expressed his appreciation for the Center and noted that it has been a very productive year with a lot of good discussions and wonderful examples of how data can be used as a flashlight. Dr. Fielder reminded the Governing Board that the next meeting was on March 8th. Ms. Schulz noted that Friday’s during legislative session often creates a conflict and requested that the meeting move to a Monday. After some discussion, the members agreed to move the next meeting to Monday, March 4, 2019 at the same time and location. Dr. Salmon made a motion to adjourn the meeting, which was seconded by Ms. Schulz. The meeting concluded at 11:40 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Ross Goldstein  
Executive Director

Approved: March 4, 2019